

*SC NAACP v. Alexander,*  
D.S.C. Case No. 3:21-cv-03302-MGL-TJH-RMG

# Exhibit K

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
3 COLUMBIA DIVISION

4 THE SOUTH CAROLINA )  
5 STATE CONFERENCE OF )  
6 THE NAACP, et al., )

7 Plaintiffs, )

Case No. 3:21-CV-03302-MGL-  
TJH-RMG

8 vs. )

9 THOMAS C. )  
10 ALEXANDER, et al., )

11 Defendants. )  
12 )  
13 )

14 Videotaped Remote Deposition of  
15 SENATOR GEORGE EARLE CAMPSER, III  
16 (Taken by Plaintiffs)  
17 Isle of Palms, South Carolina  
18 Friday, August 5, 2022  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 Reported in Stenotype by  
25 Lauren M. McIntee, RPR, CRR  
Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

APPEARANCES

ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFFS:

John S. Cusick, Esquire (via Zoom)  
Leah C. Aden, Esquire (via Zoom)  
NAACP Legal Defense & Educational Fund, Inc.  
40 Rector Street, 5th Floor  
New York, New York 10006  
(212) 965-7715  
Jcusick@naacpldf.org  
Laden@naacpldf.org

-and-

Adriel Cepeda, Esquire (via Zoom)  
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation  
125 Broad Street, 18th Floor  
New York, New York 10004  
(212) 549-2500  
acepedaderieux@aclu.org

ON BEHALF OF THE SENATE DEFENDANTS:

Vordman Carlisle Traywick, III, Esquire (via Zoom)  
Cynthia Nygord, Esquire (via Zoom)  
Robinson Gray, LLC  
1310 Gadsden Street  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201  
(803) 231-7845  
ltraywick@robinsongray.com  
Cnygord@robinsongray.com

-and-

John M. Gore, Esquire (via Zoom)  
Jones Day  
51 Louisiana Avenue NW,  
Washington, District of Columbia 20001  
(202) 879-3939  
Jmgore@jonesday.com

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

ON BEHALF OF THE ELECTION DEFENDANTS:  
Jane W. Trinkley, Esquire (via Zoom)  
Burr & Forman, LLP  
1221 Main Street, Suite 1800  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201  
(803) 753-3241  
Jtrinkley@burr.com

ON BEHALF OF THE HOUSE DEFENDANTS:  
Rhett Ricard, Esquire (via Zoom)  
Nexsen Pruet, LLC  
205 King Street, Suite 400  
Charleston, South Carolina 29401  
(843) 720-1707  
Rricard@nexsenpruet.com

ALSO PRESENT:  
  
Brendan Rolland (via Zoom)  
  
Michael Kirby, Videographer (via Zoom)

1 VIDEOTAPED REMOTE DEPOSITION OF SENATOR GEORGE EARLE  
2 CAMPSSEN, III, a witness called on behalf of Plaintiffs,  
3 before Lauren M. McIntee, Registered Professional  
4 Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter, and Notary  
5 Public, in and for the State of North Carolina, in Isle  
6 of Palms, South Carolina, on Friday, August 5, 2022,  
7 commencing at 9:10 a.m.

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## INDEX OF EXAMINATIONS

By Mr. Cusick.....	Page 9
By Mr. Traywick.....	Page 210

## INDEX OF EXHIBITS

NUMBER	EXHIBIT	MARKED
Exhibit 1	Subpoena	46
Exhibit 2	Senator George Campsen's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' Subpoena to Produce Documents, Information, or Objects or to Permit Inspection of Premises in a Civil Action	49
Exhibit 3	Text Messages (SCSENATE_00027301 to 27316)	57
Exhibit 4	2021 Policy For Public Plan Submissions, South Carolina Senate Judiciary Committee Redistricting Subcommittee (SCSENATE_00003723 to 3724)	111
Exhibit 5	Email Exchange Ending on the First Page From Lynn Teague to Paula Benson, Dated September 30, 2021 (SCSENATE_00003749 to 3751)	114
Exhibit 6	Email Exchange Ending on the First Page From Lynn Aden to Senate Redistricting, et al., Dated October 8, 2021 (SCSENATE_00003798 to 3834)	116
Exhibit 7	2021 Redistricting Guidelines, South Carolina Senate Judiciary Committee, Redistricting Subcommittee (SCSENATE_00003721 to 3722)	118
Exhibit 8	July 20th of 2021 Hearing Transcript (SCNAACP_CD_011429 to 11485)	124

1		EXHIBITS (Cont'd)	
2	NUMBER	EXHIBIT	MARKED
3	Exhibit 9	September 13, 2021, Email From Madison Faulk to Maura Baker with Attachments (SCSENATE_00022919 to 22925)	157
5	Exhibit 10	November 12th Senate Judiciary Hearing (SCNAACP_CD_011844 to 11843)	159
7	Exhibit 11	Staff Subcommittee Plan Map	163
8	Exhibit 12	November 29th, 2021, Hearing Transcript (SCNAACP_CD_011729 to 11934)	171
10	Exhibit 13	January 5, 2022, Email From Will Roberts to Senator Campsen (SCSENATE_00022581 to 22584)	174
12	Exhibit 14	Text Messages (SCSENATE_00027173 to 27174)	177
13	Exhibit 15	Email Exchange Ending on the First Page From Breedon John to Chip Campsen, et al., Dated October 8, 2021, with Attachment (SCSENATE_00022547 to 22549)	178
14	Exhibit 16	January 11, 2022, Email From Breedon John to Chip Campsen, et al., with Attachment (SCSENATE_00022561 to 22564)	180
15	Exhibit 17	January 11, 2022, Email From Michelle McGee to Luke Rankin, et al. (SCSENATE_00022556 to 22557)	181
16	Exhibit 18	January 13, 2022, Hearing Transcript (SCNAACP_CD_011935 to 12054)	188
17	Exhibit 19	January 17, 2022, Email From Robert Oppermann to Andy Fiffick with Attachment (SCSENATE_00003269 to 3277)	193

1	EXHIBITS (Cont'd)		
2	NUMBER	EXHIBITS	MARKED
3	Exhibit 20	List of Written Testimony Received	196
4		After Announcement of Meeting,	
5		January 11, 2022	
		(SCSENATE_00023933 to 24040)	
6	Exhibit 21	January 16, 2022, Email From Will	197
7		Roberts to Andy Fiffick with	
		Attachment	
		(SCSENATE_000022528 to 22530)	
8	Exhibit 22	January 17, 2022, Email From	199
9		Breedon John to Chip Campsen, et	
10		al., Zoom Invite	
		(SCSENATE_00022510)	
11	Exhibit 23	January 18, 2022, Email From Paula	199
12		Benson to Chip Campsen, et al.,	
		with Attachment	
		(SCSENATE_000022356 to 22364)	
13	Exhibit 24	January 18, 2022, Email From Luke	201
14		Rankin to Andy Fiffick with	
15		Attachment	
		(SCSENATE_00022289 to 22291)	
16	Exhibit 25	January 19, 2022, Hearing	204
17		Transcript	
		(SCNAACP_CD_013197 to 13264)	
18	Exhibit 26	January 20, 2022, Hearing	207
		Transcript	



1 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're on the record at  
2 9:10 a.m. This is the deposition of Senator George  
3 E. Campsen, III. This deposition is being held on  
4 August 5th, 2022. The court reporter is Lauren  
5 McIntee. The videographer is Michael Kirby. The  
6 court reporter will now do the swearing.

7 THE COURT REPORTER: Participating attorneys  
8 recognize that all parties, including the witness  
9 and court reporter, are participating remotely. In  
10 lieu of an oath administered in person, the witness  
11 will verbally declare that their testimony in this  
12 deposition is under penalty of perjury and will be  
13 the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the  
14 truth.

15 Counsel stipulate that all objections to the  
16 remote participation are waived. Please state your  
17 name and indicate your agreement on the record.

18 MR. TRAYWICK: Lisle Traywick agrees on  
19 behalf of the Senate defendants.

20 MR. CUSICK: John Cusick agrees behalf of  
21 plaintiffs.

22 MS. TRINKLEY: Jane Trinkley on behalf of the  
23 Election defendants.

24 THE COURT REPORTER: If that's all, counsel,  
25 you may proceed.

1 MR. CUSICK: Thank you.

2 EXAMINATION

3 BY MR. CUSICK:

4 Q. Good morning, Senator Campsen. How are you  
5 doing today?

6 A. Good morning. Doing fine. Thank you.

7 Q. My name is John Cusick. I'm one of the  
8 attorneys representing the plaintiffs in this lawsuit,  
9 The South Carolina State Conference of the NAACP versus  
10 Alexander. If you could please state your full name for  
11 the record, spelling your last name.

12 A. George Earle Campsen, III. C-A-M-P-S-E-N.

13 Q. Great. Thank you.

14 MR. CUSICK: And I'd like to just briefly go  
15 around the virtual room, if you will, for any  
16 attorneys planning to make an appearance today. And  
17 we can begin with House defendants.

18 Hearing none, I will turn to the Election  
19 defendants, Ms. Trinkley.

20 MS. TRINKLEY: We're here.

21 MR. CUSICK: Great. And anyone else from the  
22 Senate defendants?

23 MR. TRAYWICK: Lisle Traywick here on behalf  
24 of the Senate defendants, and I believe John Gore is  
25 participating remotely as well.

1           A.       That would have been his call, yes.

2           Q.       But you weren't consulted on any of those  
3 decisions, even if it would have been his ultimate  
4 decision on whether to make it or not?

5           A.       Sometimes he may consult me. And he never --  
6 it's true with every chairman of the committee. The  
7 chairman of the committee makes the call and he may  
8 consult members, but he never consulted me about hiring  
9 a demographer that I can recall.

10          Q.       Outside of the subcommittee public hearings,  
11 were there regular meetings among the members where you  
12 all met that were not public?

13                   MR. TRAYWICK: Object to the form.

14          A.       No, not as a -- there may be a few members in  
15 the map room looking at different maps, but never a full  
16 committee or never a majority of the committee.

17 BY MR. CUSICK:

18          Q.       Did you have any regular meetings with  
19 subcommittee staff regarding congressional  
20 redistricting? I know we'll talk about some specific  
21 meetings, but was there a general standing meeting or a  
22 regular meeting that you met with staff?

23          A.       No.

24          Q.       Were any of your meetings on congressional  
25 redistricting for maps that you were proposing or

1 considering, were there any other outside counsel  
2 outside of Mr. Terreni who participated in those  
3 meetings?

4 A. In which -- which type of meetings?

5 Q. Any meetings discussing proposed or maps that  
6 were being considered that you were a part of with  
7 Senate staff or Senator Rankin?

8 A. Yeah, we -- I mean, with -- with John Gore.  
9 We also sought his evaluation of the maps. Are they  
10 defensible? Are we going to get any Voting Rights Act  
11 violation? Any problems? We also sought his legal  
12 advice.

13 Q. Do you recall how many times you were in a  
14 meeting with Mr. Gore for congressional redistricting?

15 A. Well, there were virtual meetings. I can't  
16 remember, but I -- maybe five. Three to five probably.

17 Q. No more than -- so no more than five from  
18 your recollection?

19 A. That's my recollection, but it's a  
20 recollection.

21 Q. And you said the meetings were all virtual?

22 A. Yes. For -- yes.

23 Q. I'm not asking you to discuss any of the  
24 content of those meetings, but did you see him in a  
25 similar role as Mr. Terreni of providing legal advice to

1 questions that might come up for congressional  
2 redistricting?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Do you know who made the decision to bring in  
5 Mr. Gore to advise in this capacity?

6 A. I don't know. My -- my impression that it  
7 was Chairman Rankin. I don't know that. I'm only  
8 assuming that.

9 Q. Outside of the firm that Mr. Gore represents,  
10 Jones Day, were there any other attorneys outside of  
11 Mr. Terreni and Mr. Gore who were involved in these  
12 five, three to five meetings?

13 A. Not that I can recall.

14 Q. During these three to five meetings, was  
15 there anyone in charge of taking notes or meeting  
16 minutes?

17 A. No.

18 Q. I think we covered this already. Outside of  
19 Representative Simrill and potentially Representative  
20 Newton, you did not have any interactions with any House  
21 staff members?

22 A. No.

23 Q. Dennis Patrick -- or Patrick Dennis, sorry?

24 A. No. I didn't have any interaction with  
25 Patrick Dennis.

1 Q. Would you say you had to work with the House  
2 to pass the congressional map that was ultimately signed  
3 by the governor?

4 A. Not really. I didn't work with them on our  
5 map. The only thing that I did, are y'all, are y'all  
6 okay -- are y'all going to be open looking at a  
7 different map than what y'all passed? Because we  
8 don't -- and the answer was yes. And that was really  
9 the only interaction.

10 Q. I know we briefly touched earlier in the  
11 deposition about the map room. What's a brief  
12 description of that for how or your understanding of the  
13 congressional map room and how you used it?

14 A. Well, it's a -- it's a program that has all  
15 the data, precincts of the whole state and the data on  
16 each precinct, each population. You take up, you can  
17 look at any race, any election that occurred and see  
18 what the results are in that precinct, in the  
19 Trump/Biden race or Graham/Harrison race.

20 And you have precinct lines and you have, you  
21 can pull up the benchmark plan, which was the existing,  
22 or at that point the existing plan. And you can work on  
23 a plan and save it and pull up a plan that maybe had  
24 worked for them previously. So it's a -- it's a  
25 computer program that produces that type of data and

1 adopting these guidelines?

2 A. (Inaudible.)

3 Q. Sorry. There might have been a lag there. I  
4 don't know if anyone else heard that.

5 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Yeah, had a little skip  
6 there. If you had just said something, Senator, if  
7 you could repeat it.

8 THE WITNESS: No, I didn't say anything.

9 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. Just wanted to make  
10 sure. Thank you.

11 BY MR. CUSICK:

12 Q. And what was the purpose of the subcommittee  
13 creating and adopting the guidelines?

14 A. Well, to lay out factors that you take into  
15 account in the redistricting process and also to help  
16 keep us from violating any legal -- any -- any laws that  
17 we are subject to in the process.

18 Q. Was it your understanding that maps the staff  
19 created and were made public had to comply with these  
20 guidelines?

21 A. Could you restate that question again?

22 Q. Was it your understanding that any map the  
23 subcommittee produced had to comply with these  
24 guidelines?

25 A. Well, the goal is to comply, but you never

1 can draw a map that -- compliance is in the eye of the  
2 holder, number one. And it's guidelines. There is no  
3 objective goal line you reach. And -- and there's  
4 always some give and take. You maybe -- you maybe  
5 comply with one guideline more fully, but the next one  
6 not quite as fully.

7 But they're guidelines and things that are  
8 markers, guardrails to keep you in the road, keep you  
9 moving in the right direction, but you can -- you can't  
10 fully -- sometimes you have to -- may have to diminish  
11 your degree of compliance with one guideline to comply  
12 with another and be in congruence. So they're  
13 guidelines. So it's hard to say they -- you have to --  
14 compliance even is in the eye of the holder in reality  
15 in a lot of these instances.

16 Q. But would it be fair to say that these  
17 guidelines guided the subcommittee's assessment and  
18 creation of proposed congressional maps?

19 A. Yes. We're -- yes.

20 Q. Would -- would you also agree it's helpful  
21 for publishing this so it would give guidance to members  
22 of the public for what they should be considering in  
23 both assessing and drawing proposed maps?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Is there anything that the subcommittee



1 created or relied upon that supplemented this criteria?

2 A. Well, case law that we are subject to.

3 Mentioned one, I think mentioned one case in, two cases  
4 in here. There's a lot more case law we're subject to.

5 Q. And you know, assuming that case law is -- is  
6 subsumed within the legal requirements, is there  
7 anything else outside of this document that was relied  
8 upon or created to supplement the guidelines by the  
9 subcommittee?

10 A. As far as the subcommittee adopting anything  
11 different, no, that didn't happen. Anything additional,  
12 that did not happen.

13 Q. And while -- and I didn't -- it might not  
14 have adopted. Are you aware of anything that the  
15 subcommittee or staff members relied upon that they  
16 considered criteria or guidelines that isn't included  
17 within this document?

18 A. No.

19 Q. Would you also agree that publishing these  
20 guidelines helped achieve the subcommittee's goal of  
21 providing transparency?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And why so?

24 A. Because the public would know factors that we  
25 consider.

1 Campsen?

2 A. Are we looking at another exhibit here?

3 Q. This is Senate Amendment 1. Not looking at  
4 it.

5 A. Okay.

6 Q. This is the one we've talked about, yeah.

7 A. Right. Yeah, I sponsored that amendment,  
8 yes.

9 Q. And so would it be fair to say that was  
10 your -- you were the primary decisionmaker involved in  
11 that involvement?

12 A. Well, there were others that -- that gave  
13 input, but prob- -- but probably gave probably the, gave  
14 the most input anyway to it.

15 Q. How long did it take to create that amendment  
16 before it was publicly posted on January 11th?

17 A. I really can't recall. It was a process that  
18 went on, I -- I can't recall.

19 Q. Were you involved in all meetings regarding  
20 that amendment, or were there meetings you might not  
21 have been involved in discussing, discussing it?

22 A. No, I think there may have been meetings that  
23 I wasn't involved in. I'm not certain, but there may  
24 have been.

25 Q. Do you recall how many meetings you attended

1 related to the development of that plan?

2 A. I don't.

3 Q. As an amendment that you sponsored, would you  
4 have been the primary person to getting it ready before  
5 it was publicly posted, or responsible for?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And I won't run down the long laundry list of  
8 similar questions that we've talked to you about  
9 analyses and reports, but you know, we've talked about  
10 Mr. Terreni, Mr. Fiffick, and other folks who are legal  
11 counsel. If you had any questions about how it complied  
12 with the redistricting guidelines, your Senate  
13 Amendment 1, would that have been a question that went  
14 to them?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Would any -- was Mr. Gore at all involved in  
17 any of those meetings or discussions about Senate  
18 Amendment 1?

19 MR. TRAYWICK: Object to the form of the  
20 question.

21 A. I believe, it's my recollection he looked at  
22 the final product for evaluation of whether it was  
23 problematic, defensible, are we going to be -- are we --  
24 are we violating -- violating any -- any requirements?  
25 Does it make us vulnerable to litigation? I mean, he

1 did do that, but that was I think in looking -- in a  
2 look at the final product as I recall.

3 BY MR. CUSICK:

4 Q. And just about as familiar with the process  
5 of sponsoring an amendment, but as the lead -- would it  
6 -- would it be fair to say you were the lead sponsor or  
7 the sponsor?

8 A. Yes, you could say either.

9 Q. And so for any analyses or review that needed  
10 to be conducted, would that have been at your direction?

11 A. The staff would have done that as a matter of  
12 course.

13 Q. And they would have conducted the same types  
14 of reviews that we've already discussed today about  
15 other iterations of maps you've been involved in?

16 A. That's correct. And I certainly asked them,  
17 is it defensible or is it going to work? And, so. But  
18 I didn't really need to ask them. I knew they would do  
19 that analysis.

20 Q. Would you say one of the objectives for CD1  
21 was to make it more politically advantageous for  
22 Republicans?

23 A. To keep it a Republican district, that was  
24 one of the --

25 Q. And what was the process?

1 A. -- goals, it is.

2 Q. And what steps did you take to -- to  
3 determine whether it would remain a Republican district?

4 A. Looked at the political numbers as far as the  
5 vote counts and among the -- in the precincts for the  
6 district. And it really, it really moved the needle  
7 very, just very slightly actually. Could have made a  
8 lot more Republican, but also would have violated  
9 more -- perhaps run afoul of some of the federal law or  
10 the redistricting principles that we are subject to.

11 In fact, probably took a little -- probably a  
12 lot -- a lot of people say should have been -- been more  
13 Republican, but I wanted to honor those principles. And  
14 we -- we moved it like a point and a half, one and a  
15 half percentage points to the Republican side. It was  
16 basically a swing district, and we moved -- the  
17 Republican vote went up like one and a half percentage  
18 points.

19 Q. Did you consider CD1 a swing district before  
20 the new -- the new lines?

21 A. It was -- it was pretty -- pretty close to a  
22 swing district, yes. I mean, you had Joe Cunningham was  
23 elected and Nancy Mace was elected. It was pretty much  
24 a swing, or close to it anyway. The -- so still a  
25 Republican district, but close to being a swing, is what